

Wells, were proved by the oath of Lamb. He has no recollection that his brother was offered as evidence against him.

Adam Miller says, that Joshua Lamb was objected to on account of his having left the city, and going to Marlborough to work, which was admitted. His brother's evidence was offered, to prove that he went to Marlborough to reside, but the offer was made after Joshua Lamb had voted, but his testimony was not taken.

Doctor Wells testifies, in the case of Joseph Gardner, that he did vote at the October election. There were objections made to his vote, on the grounds of non residence, but by whom he does not recollect. There was no evidence produced that he was not a resident, his own oath was received that he was a resident, and he was permitted to vote. I did not see his ballot.

Doctor Dennis Claude states, that in the case of Joseph Gardner, the fact was proved, that he had commenced his residence in the city at a period to entitle him to vote, and that he had followed the occupation of a boatman.

James Williamson states, that he was not present when the vote of Joseph Gardner was taken.

Jeremiah Hughes says, that he has a perfect recollection of the period when Joseph Gardner came to town, he having applied to him for a house; it was more than six months before the election. He had been, before coming to the city, sailing in a boat from South river.

Adam Miller states, that the vote of Joseph Gardner was objected to on account of non residence. The objection was made by William Taylor. I have no recollection that he was sworn. He stated before the judges, that the said Gardner did not come to the city to live until the sixteenth of April.

Doctor Wells states, that Thomas Brashears did vote at the October election, and that objections were made to his vote, (by whom he does not recollect,) on account of non residence. It was objected to said Brashears that he had lived in the District of Columbia, and had not obtained a residence in the state. It was proved that the said Brashears was born in the state, and had gone to the District of Columbia to serve an apprenticeship to the trade of shoe making; that as soon after he arrived of age, as he could procure money enough to bear his expenses to Annapolis, he came here, and the judges considered him entitled to vote. I did not see how the said Brashears voted.

Dr. Claude says, in the case of Thomas Brashears—The facts were strictly examined. He went to the city of Washington for the sole purpose of learning the trade of shoe making. that after arriving at age he never engaged there as a journeyman, that he was a native of the state, and that he had lived more than six months in the city.